United Nations S/PV.3954

Security Council

Fifty-third Year

Provisional

3954th Meeting

Wednesday, 16 December 1998, 9 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Buallay	(Bahrain)
Members:	Brazil	Mr. Amorim
	China	Mr. Qin Huasun
	Costa Rica	Mr. Niehaus
	France	Mr. Dejammet
	Gabon	Mr. Essonghé
	Gambia	Mr. Jagne
	Japan	Mr. Konishi
	Kenya	Mrs. Odera
	Portugal	Mr. Monteiro
	Russian Federation	Mr. Lavrov
	Slovenia	Mr. Türk
	Sweden	Mr. Dahlgren
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Burleigh

Agenda

Maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building

98-86704 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 9.30 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): Members of the Security Council will recall that the date and agenda for this meeting of the Security Council were agreed upon by members of the Council in its prior consultations.

The agenda was adopted.

Maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Croatia, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, Slovakia, the Sudan, Tunisia and Ukraine, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Baali (Algeria), Mr. Petrella (Argentina), Ms. Wensley (Australia), Mr. Sucharipa (Austria), Mr. Chowdhury (Bangladesh), Mr. Sacirbey (Bosnia and Herzegovina), Mr. Fowler (Canada), Mr. Simonovic (Croatia), Mr. Elaraby (Egypt), Mr. Sharma (India), Mr. Wibisono (Indonesia), Miss Durrant (Jamaica), Mr. Hasmy (Malaysia), Mr. Enkhsaikhan (Mongolia), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. Gambari (Nigeria), Mr. Kolby (Norway), Mr. Kamel (Pakistan), Mr. Lee See-young (Republic of Korea), Mr. Varso (Slovakia), Mr. Erwa (Sudan), Mr. Hachani (Tunisia) and Mr. Yel'chenko (Ukraine) took seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Mr. Qin Huasun (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation highly appreciates this open debate held under your presidency, Sir. Maintaining international peace and security is the lofty responsibility entrusted to the Council by the Charter of the United Nations, as well as by the vast number of United Nations Member States. Therefore, it is extremely useful for the Council to listen to Member States' views on the major issues of principle concerning international peace and security.

The world is undergoing profound changes at the turn of the century. The desire for peace, stability and development has become the shared understanding and common pursuit of all Member States of this Organization. In regions where war and conflicts persist, such as Africa and Central Asia in particular, putting an end to conflicts at an early date so as to create a secure environment for their socio-economic development has become the international community's top priority, and thus calls for the meaningful support and assistance of the United Nations. The Council's primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security is both unshirkable and irreplaceable.

Today, the Chinese delegation would like to reiterate in particular that it is necessary for the Council to respond positively to the repeated appeals of African countries and to translate its attention to African issues into concrete deeds. The Council should play an especially constructive role in connection with the questions of Somalia, Sierra Leone, the Great Lakes region and so forth. It should take into serious consideration the reasonable requests of Africa, effectively assist and coordinate with African efforts and give active support to regional organizations, such as the Organization of African Unity, that require funds and technical expertise.

In recent years, the Council has become more, rather than less, involved in the internal conflicts of some countries. The Chinese delegation has always held that the Council should strictly adhere to the purposes and principles of the Charter, act upon the consent or request of the country concerned and make every endeavour to help resolve conflicts through peaceful means. We are not in favour of interfering in a country's internal affairs under the pretext of alleviating humanitarian crises or the frequent wielding of military threats or intervention by invoking Chapter VII of the Charter.

The Chinese delegation would like to emphasize here that all multinational military actions authorized by the Council should strictly conform to norms set by the Council and standardize the mechanism of fulfilling responsibilities to the Council, reporting to the Council and accepting the Council's political guidance. China is strongly opposed to any act of power politics that unilaterally resorts to the use or threat of the use of force in international relations while circumventing the Council. In our view, such an act violates international law and the norms governing international relations and is in itself a grave threat to international peace and security.

Maintaining and consolidating peace after conflict requires enormous efforts. In regions where war has just ended, effective support and assistance from the international community are necessary, since the political and security structures in such regions are still delicate and their social economy has been severely damaged. China supports the active involvement of the United Nations system in efforts for peace consolidation and peace-building in post-conflict regions. We would like to make the following three observations in this connection.

First, equal attention should be given to all post-conflict regions. We have noted with concern that certain hot issues have become the focus of attention while others have been unfairly put on the back burner. We see that in some places where there is no longer a threat to international peace and security, United Nations peacekeeping operations are still on the ground, while at the same time other places, such as Africa, which are experiencing much harsher humanitarian and economic situations, are stuck in various difficulties in obtaining capital assistance and United Nations involvement. The Chinese delegation calls for the elimination of such practices of double standards in meting out post-conflict assistance.

Secondly, in the peace consolidation process in post-conflict regions, international efforts should be attuned to the will of the country concerned. The international community should get involved only on the basis of the commitment to maintaining the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of the country concerned. The way of development chosen by the people of the country concerned should be respected. Consideration should be given to the most pressing needs of the country concerned: the funds and technical assistance that it needs most in its rehabilitation and development. China has always been opposed to attaching political conditions to assistance, and even more strongly opposed to the practice of using involvement in post-conflict peace-building to promote specific value systems or achieve political ends.

Thirdly, frankly speaking, what is most needed in post-conflict reconstruction is capital and technical assistance. The Chinese delegation maintains that the role and capacity of United Nations organs in the socio-economic field should be strengthened. We are gravely concerned at the marginalization of relevant United Nations functions, including those of the Economic and Social Council, on major international economic development and assistance issues. We are even more strongly opposed to the weakening of the role of United Nations organs in the socio-economic fields, on the one hand, while placing a large load of social issues on the Security Council agenda, on the other. We are not in favour of placing all the problems of all conflict areas in the hands of the Security Council, not least on the ground of the division of work among the various organs of the Organization. That is not good for the normal functioning of other United Nations bodies, including the General Assembly, which is composed of all States Members of the United Nations. At the same time, such practices might affect priorities in the Security Council's work and impair its efficiency. We believe that it would be helpful for the maintenance of international peace and for the promotion of world development if the United Nations and, in particular, the Security Council were to improve its practices with regard to those three elements.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of China for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. Lavrov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): Recent years have been characterized by an active evolution in the theory and practice of international peacekeeping. This is an objective process. The enormity and complexity of the tasks facing us in that area dictate the need for a constant improvement of the mechanisms for preventing and settling regional crises. The peacekeeping efforts of the international community must be as effective as possible. At the same time, the United Nations Charter, which assigns to the Security Council primary responsibility for and a central role in this very important area, remains the immutable and universal legal basis for the maintenance of international peace and security.

It was precisely on the basis of the United Nations Charter that the fundamental, universally recognized

principles of peacekeeping were formed including, first and foremost, ensuring that the Security Council maintained political leadership and control over peacekeeping operations, impartiality, the agreement of the parties and the existence of clearly formulated mandates for those operations, backed by sufficient resources. Precise adherence to those principles in practice is a prerequisite for the success of any peacekeeping operation.

Russia has consistently based its policies on the conviction that the use of force by the international community is an exceptional and extreme measure, to be taken only in cases where a real threat to international peace and security exists under Chapter VII of the Charter and when all political and diplomatic opportunities for the settlement of a conflict have been exhausted. Enforcement peacekeeping operations, which are justified under such conditions, can be implemented only through a decision of the Security Council and under the tight political and appropriate operational control of the Council. This also applies fully to enforcement operations carried out by regional organizations or multinational coalitions, which cannot be deployed without the authorization of the Security Council and which must be transparent and accountable to the Council.

Modern international practice offers quite a few examples of constructive interaction between regional organizations or multinational coalitions and the United Nations in the conduct of peacekeeping operations on various continents, with the Security Council playing the central role. Such a positive practice must be encouraged and strengthened as much as possible.

Against that background, we must express our concern about attempts to make it possible for individual States or coalitions to use force or take enforcement measures without the approval of the Security Council. In that respect, the clearest such attempt can be seen in the drawing up of a new strategic concept of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). According to reports, an idea is being considered to transform NATO into a leading international peacekeeping organization whose actions, which would extend beyond the bounds of the geographic zone for which the Alliance has responsibility, would be taken solely on the basis of its own assessments and decisions, thereby sidestepping the Security Council.

It is clear that we are talking about attempts to replace the Charter-based functions and the prerogatives of the Security Council with unilateral actions taken by regional mechanisms, directly contravening the United Nations Charter. The implementation of such attempts could destabilize and destroy the entire international system, which is founded on the primacy of the United Nations and on international law. We trust that in considering such concepts the relevant States will remember that in addition to being members of a defensive alliance created during the cold-war era, they also bear responsibility, as Members of the United Nations, for respecting the system of collective security enshrined in the Charter.

We are convinced of the need to strengthen the central role of the United Nations in peacekeeping. The resolution of this problem is linked to the development of the potential of the United Nations in the area of rapid crisis response, and Russia supports the efforts undertaken by Member States and by the United Nations Secretariat to enhance the effectiveness of peacekeeping operations and to expand their resource base.

We are open to the possibility of practical cooperation being further developed in this area. The most effective means to achieve that objective remains the system of United Nations stand-by arrangements, which is currently being formulated. We welcome the strategy that is being established at international level for conflict prevention and settlement in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. An important component of this strategy is post-conflict peace-building.

The practice of post-conflict peace-building, which is developing vigorously, is so far raising more questions than it is providing answers, but it has become clear that without effective efforts in this area it will be impossible to reliably establish necessary conditions for the non-resumption of conflicts.

A number of concrete peace-building tasks, such as disarmament, the demobilization and reintegration into peaceful life of armed parties included in conflicts and demining are sometimes included in the mandates of multifunctional peacekeeping operations conducted under Security Council mandates. In practice, a smooth transition is thereby ensured from the peacekeeping stage to the following phase of post-conflict peace-building. On the whole, however, post-conflict peace-building represents a fully independent aspect of that complex peacekeeping strategy, and usually provides for the implementation of large-scale, long-term and often expensive projects that go beyond the bounds of peacekeeping operations. In concentrating primarily on a solution to the social, economic and humanitarian tasks

of recovery, peace-building for the most part falls within the sphere of competence of the Economic and Social Council and the specialized agencies of the United Nations system, which must work in close contact with other international financial, economic and humanitarian Organizations, in particular in providing material and financial resources for peace-building activities.

In this context, we attach great significance to the reactivation of Article 65 of the Charter with regard to the Economic and Social Council's provision of information and assistance to the Security Council. This chapter of the Charter is also fully applicable on the preventive level, insofar as the Security Council can and must draw the attention of the Economic and Social Council to the relevant problems of various regions, as the Security Council, within the framework of its competence, closely follows destabilizing trends in the social, economic and humanitarian fields that which can lead to the emergence or escalation of conflicts.

The indispensable political role in the sphere of post-conflict peace-building must be carried out by the General Assembly by, *inter alia*, defining the basic framework and criteria for activity in that area, including abidance by the fundamental principle of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States. Such interaction of the Security Council with other major United Nations organs is fully in keeping with the Charter and with the task of strengthening and improving coordination within the framework of the United Nations system. We are ready for constructive work in this area so that the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter can be activated.

Mr. Burleigh (United States of America): It is a pleasure to see you in the Chair, Mr. President.

In the last several years, a new type of threat to international peace and security has come into prominence. It often emanates not from external dangers but from internal crises that destabilize a State and risk drawing its neighbours into a downward spiral of collapse and conflict.

In a number of cases, opposing sides in such countries have signed peace accords that led to United Nations peacekeeping operations to help the parties implement the accords. Unlike traditional peacekeeping operations, whose principal objective was to monitor and report on a ceasefire, these peacekeeping operations have had multifaceted tasks — for example, in the mandates for past operations in Cambodia, Mozambique and Rwanda and in a number of the United Nations peacekeeping operations under way today.

Members of such peacekeeping operations have been called upon, *inter alia*, to provide security, monitor police, prepare for elections and monitor respect for human rights. To accomplish these tasks, the missions have included sizeable civilian as well as large military components, with the civilian members involved in activities that would contribute to a lasting peace after the peacekeepers left. In nine of the current 16 peacekeeping operations, the services of civilian police are required to help meet public security challenges in such countries as Bosnia, Haiti, Angola and the Central African Republic. Indeed, civilian police now comprise about 20 per cent of all peacekeeping forces.

Some of the above tasks, however, may go beyond peacekeeping to the area of peace-building, a transition that we in the United Nations need to understand and manage better.

In terms of this transition from peacekeeping to peace-building, we see three sets of concerns — the division of labour between peacekeeping and peace-building; resources; and coordination.

First, the division of labour between peacekeeping and peace-building: Where should the line be drawn?

Peacekeeping mandates need to include some short-term activities that will enhance the ability of peacekeeping troops, military observers and/or civilian police to stabilize the immediate situation and maintain the momentum for peace. These activities would include steps such as demobilization, disarmament and reintegration of combatants, and demining. They may also include providing support for elections or short-term support for public security institutions through monitoring and mentoring of local police.

However, longer-term support to rebuild or restructure basic public security institutions, such as police, prisons and the judiciary, fall beyond the scope of peacekeeping and into the area of peace-building. Admittedly, there is a "twilight zone" between peacekeeping and peace-building, and it will not always be possible to draw a clear distinction. Judgements will need to be made. In addition, while some peace-building activities might occur only after a peacekeeping operation ends, they also might well be part of the peace accord which the peacekeeping mission is intended to support.

In any case, both the United Nations and the host Government need to focus early on longer-term peace-building tasks and seek the appropriate domestic, multilateral, and bilateral backing for them. Ideally, the Security Council should work out with the host Government a timetable for accomplishing specific objectives in peace-building to contribute to the stability which the peacekeeping operations help provide.

Secondly, resources. Investing in peace-building is investing for the future stability and prosperity of a country that has suffered the ravages of conflict. Countries that seek peacekeeping support from the international community need to recognize that it is just as important for them to marshal resources to secure the peace — through peace-building — as it was to marshal resources for conflict in the first place. United Nations agencies, international financial institutions, bilateral donors — and, perhaps most important, the host countries themselves — need to understand that devoting a share of limited resources to furthering good governance will help create a climate in which economic growth can occur. Without stability, security, the rule of law and respect for human rights, resources spent on development will yield little fruit. And without the clear engagement of the host country in achieving these objectives, outside assistance will ultimately fail.

On one thing we can easily agree — that the United Nations itself will never have adequate resources to do the enormous job that serious peace-building entails. But it can play an important role as coordinator of the United Nations system and the international community as well.

So the third concern we must address is coordination. Coordinating peacekeeping and peace-building activities and moving a country from conflict to peace-building requires strong leadership. As determined by the Security Council, this political leadership can be provided by a special representative of the Secretary-General, a special coordinator, a transitional administrator or other high representative of the Secretary-General. It will be particularly important to clarify lines of authority among the United Nations agencies involved to establish the basis for full cooperation.

Whatever the title of the individual, he or she will need to interact credibly with heads of Governments and representatives of United Nations agencies, the World Bank, regional development banks, international financial institutions and other organizations contributing to peace-building resources. Civil society, the private sector and non-governmental organizations are likewise an important part of this mix. From experience in countries like Liberia, we know it is important for humanitarian and development assistance donors across the board to get involved in peace-building early, to coordinate closely and to share experiences from previous endeavours.

The United States welcomes the renewed interest in post-conflict peace-building, and commends you, our President, for taking the initiative to organize today's discussion.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of the United States for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. Niehaus (Costa Rica) *(interpretation from Spanish):* I should like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation for your decision, Mr. President, to convene this open meeting of the Security Council to consider the question of the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building. Your initiative is a step in the right direction of promoting transparency and the participation of all Member States in the work of the Security Council. It is also significant encouragement for this principal body of our Organization to have a wide-ranging and democratic discussion of a topic that has become essential to its principal function of maintaining international peace and security.

Since the end of the cold war the international community has simultaneously taken part in and witnessed an accelerated process of broadening the concepts, contents and interpretation of the multilateral peace and security agenda. In less than 10 years our Organization has gone beyond the limited and limiting interpretation that prevailed in the previous stage of hegemonic confrontation as regards the scope of that terminology and its operational consequences.

For 45 years after the establishment of the United Nations, a restrictive interpretation of the scope of the responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, given by Member States to the Security Council and set forth in paragraph 1 of Article 24 of the Charter, restricted multilateral action to monitoring and verifying compliance with agreements on the cessation of hostilities between two or more States. The internal logic of the super-Power rivalry justified the adoption in both the work and the practice of the Security Council of this self-limitation, which was removed from reality and, as some have said, reduced the Council's principal function to the

bare minimum, to the detriment of, and ignoring, the will of the founding fathers of 1945.

Since 1989, as I have stated we seen the traditional concept replaced or enlarged, depending on one's point of view; a slow process has begun of devising and assimilating a broadened interpretation of the content and scope of "the maintenance of international peace and security".

It was in the context of this new vision of international relations that the Secretary-General, at the Council's request, outlined in the Agenda for Peace, published in 1992, the five major action areas where he thought the United Nations should be able to use the powers given it by the Charter on these fundamental matters in the new and changing international arena. The Secretary-General included in that innovative agenda the concept of post-conflict peace-building as a specific area of action for the United Nations, designed to put together and regulate all the measures to consolidate cooperation between parties, national or international, that previously had been pitted against one another, and to develop the social, economic, juridical and political infrastructure needed to prevent a return to violence and to lay down bases for sustainable and lasting peace.

As a result, we could and should say that peace-building is not a whimsical invention or an unfounded political proposal; rather, it is a deep-rooted concept with sufficient juridical and political legitimacy to become a subject to which the United Nations, and particularly the Security Council, must give attention.

Today, the great majority of Members of the United Nations agree that the restricted concept I have mentioned has been superseded and that we have now evolved into the second stage outlined at the beginning of the decade. In truth, what six years ago seemed a mere intellectual discussion has now become a reality and is gradually being included in the new doctrine being implemented by the United Nations and, more concretely, the Security Council with regard to international peace and security.

This evolution, which has brought us to a "second generation" in the maintenance of peace and security, has not occurred in a vacuum, and, as always happens, is a response to reality itself.

Thus, the new vision, which is both wide-ranging and integral, corresponds to a set of needs which, although they have existed for some time, received attention and were included in the new concept of the maintenance of international peace and security with the end of the cold war. But it also corresponds to what could be described as a new set of potentials and possibilities that emerged after 1989.

In that connection, the majority of conflicts that pose a threat to international peace and security indisputably involve political, economic and social situations that, once the strictly military aspects are resolved, require responses and solutions that are in keeping with their specific characteristics. In the light of this broad vision, therefore, the response of the international community to these new crises must incorporate the various aspects of the specific situations in a complete and multidisciplinary manner. In our view, it must address and resolve a number of particular factors.

First of all, we must note that the concept of peace-building is part of a set of realities and a link in the long chain of the maintenance of international peace and security. Peace-building presupposes that in every case the military dimension of an armed conflict has already been resolved through a cessation of hostilities and the adoption of agreements on the demobilization of combatants. It is true that although the underlying causes of a conflict go beyond the question of the war itself, the truth is that it is nearly impossible to move on to addressing those underlying causes if the armed struggle has not ceased and if the fate of combatants has not been determined. In other words, it is hard to imagine peace-building in isolation without the prior stages of negotiations — political or diplomatic, depending on the case — and of agreement on a ceasefire.

Secondly, Costa Rica has learned from its own regional experience that truly effective peace-building requires agreements and consensus among the parties to the conflict, and, although a ceasefire and demobilization are needed as a first step, must also include specific arrangements tailored to the various structural matters as well as to other issues — such as the existence of a State based on the rule of law, legal security and the enjoyment of human rights — which were at the root of the conflict. Here, we cannot fail to mention the experiences of El Salvador, Haiti and Guatemala, which have shown how fundamental the concept of an integral approach is to the achievement of a solid, lasting peace.

The third element is closely linked to the first two: the existence of genuine commitment by the parties to the conflict is a *sine qua non*. It may seem self-evident, but

let me add that it is indispensable, once a ceasefire has been put in place, to ensure that agreements on structural matters are sustainable.

Fourthly, the facts have shown that agreements comprising an integral response to today's international or national conflicts must include effective efforts at political and diplomatic negotiations. Peace does not emerge from nothing. Those same tough and valuable facts also point to the potential of resources for peaceful solutions as the ideal tools for conflict resolution. In that sphere, regional and multilateral organizations, since the end of the cold war, have proven to be the ideal forums for addressing and overcoming these crises.

The cases of Central America, Namibia, Cambodia, Mozambique and, most recently, the Central African Republic show how facilitation, good offices and mediation by international organizations and regional bodies have become effective tools for resolving conflicts and achieving solid, lasting peace agreements.

Fifthly, the acknowledged need for comprehensive agreements containing specific solutions to the various problems that lie at the root of conflicts has given rise to a comprehensive and multidisciplinary involvement by the various elements of international organizations, notably the United Nations, and by non-governmental organizations, both in defining these responses and in participating actively in their implementation. Here, the experience in Bosnia and Herzegovina has become a benchmark.

That is one very important aspect of this new vision of peace-building. It is, in fact, a question that elicits varying opinions not only on basic matters but also on the operational implications for the United Nations. Some have expressed reasonable doubts in this connection, feeling that the peace-building stage, by its very nature and by transcending and overcoming purely military matters, has become something that has more to do with other areas of international action, such as development cooperation. From the traditional viewpoint in keeping with the old logic of the days before 1989, this is, strictly speaking, true. But a new vision of the concepts of international peace and security, such as that which we share, should enable us to agree to incorporate the post-conflict stage in this broader view of the question.

Clearly, discussion of many of these matters is ongoing and continues to reflect divergent views on matters such as the role of the Security Council in this process and its links with other organs and specialized agencies of the United Nations system — although the differences in these views are narrowing. But my delegation considers that these very facts show that in the present circumstances it is illogical to insist on retaining limited and separate areas of competence for the various parts of the Organization and, above all, that there is no political sense in trying to circumscribe the concepts of international peace and security or to strip them of their meaning.

Costa Rica wishes to put forward a few points as food for thought:

Peace-building is a political concept within the broader perspective of the maintenance of international peace and security, although it can have specialized technical implications.

Peace-building must be viewed from an integral perspective. In other words, it is illogical to make it unilateral or to reduce its content to one or several of its elements.

Peace-building, as an integral and integrating concept, requires broad, multidisciplinary involvement by the international community.

Peace-building requires the acceptance and inclusion of specific areas for action by multilateral organizations on questions that were once reserved for domestic jurisdiction with respect to bolstering the State based on the rule of law. These include political watchfulness, the preparation and monitoring of elections, training and modernization in the judiciary and, most important, the promotion of and respect for all human rights.

Peace-building also requires the acceptance of special treatment for societies that have recently overcome armed conflicts and that must reconstruct their basic infrastructure. This has special implications in terms of the participation of the international financial institutions and of their relationship with such countries.

Let me conclude Costa Rica's contribution to this meeting by reaffirming our firm belief that it is vitally necessary to accept these concepts and to incorporate them in the agenda and practice of the United Nations, and of the Security Council in particular. If we want to guarantee the effectiveness of our work in keeping with our Charter obligations, and if we are truly committed to meeting today's great challenges in order to ensure a

peaceful and secure world for all, we must be able to find correct, appropriate and effective answers.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Costa Rica for the kind words he addressed to me. Allow me to note that Costa Rica's participation in the work of the Council has been extremely effective.

Mr. Dejammet (France) (*interpretation from French*): The report entitled "An Agenda for Peace" and its supplement stressed the importance of peace-building and proposed guidelines in that connection. The Security Council responded by endorsing assessments of the report in the statement made by the President of the Council on 30 April 1993, document S/25696. The Secretary-General's reform process and his report on Africa (S/1998/318), which the Council discussed on 24 September 1998, provided an opportunity to resume the debate on peace-building and to make a number of proposals.

Activities which can assist in peace-building are by nature highly varied, but they all are aimed at strengthening confidence and improving the living conditions in countries afflicted by conflicts in order to prevent the resurgence of violence and to create conditions for a lasting peace. Each situation is unique, and it would thus be presumptuous — even given this general debate in the Council — to try a priori to define the content of such peace-building activities. Nevertheless, on the basis of past and present experience, three major categories have been singled out.

The first of these categories is the strengthening of confidence and national reconciliation, which in many cases covers the return and reintegration of refugees, the demobilization and reintegration of combatants and the development of dialogue between the former parties to the conflict, as well as respect for human rights.

The second category is that of economic reconstruction, which most often includes humanitarian assistance to cope with emergency needs and also rehabilitation or the establishment of economic and social infrastructure, including in the educational system. Demining is also a very important element of this aspect.

Finally, the third category, which is part of peace-building, consists in the recreation of institutions — political institutions — which in many cases have been damaged or indeed destroyed by the conflict. The objective is to achieve good governance. This includes assistance in organizing free and democratic elections, the reconstruction and strengthening of State structures, in particular, but not only, in such sectors of sovereignty as justice and the police. Finally, and above all, this often includes, or should include, learning to share power.

Recent thinking has demonstrated that, aside from these different guidelines, there also was a need to attach specific importance to appropriate disarmament measures. In many cases, parties to the conflict have built up major weapons stocks which can contribute to a resumption of hostilities or can be disseminated in an uncontrolled fashion, thereby endangering the security of the region. In this regard, France welcomes the decision of the Secretary-General to emphasize the problem of light weapons and small-calibre weapons and their illegal trafficking, most particularly in Africa. We know that Mali originally made proposals on this subject which are now in the process of implementation. Peace-building in regions of the African continent which have been devastated by conflicts indeed hinges on decisive action to cope with the dissemination of light weapons and small-calibre weapons.

The prevention of the resumption of conflicts which the Security Council deals with or has dealt with is obviously a continuing concern. All too often, international attention dwindles once the acute crisis period has passed and once the media have focused interest elsewhere. Then the parties to the conflict, the United Nations, some countries which are more vigilant than others or present in the field must cope with the enormous task of peace-building, and this involves the medium- and long-term mobilization of all necessary means.

This is why it is important for the Security Council to take into account in advance the aspects of peace-building so that they might be integrated into a comprehensive and sure strategy for the necessary financing. Therefore, these aspects must be duly provided for within the mandate which defines a peacekeeping operation when that operation is decided upon. That mandate forms the framework for action by the United Nations and the international community.

When there is no peacekeeping operation, or after it has been completed, peace-building activities which are deemed necessary to launch or to continue should then be the subject of the appropriate agreements between the country or countries involved, on the one hand, and the various protagonists who can contribute — that is, United

Nations programmes and agencies, regional organizations, donor countries and non-governmental organizations — on the other.

But all of this, I repeat, in no way eliminates the importance and even the necessity of anticipating, at the outset of thinking on a peacekeeping operation, the peace-building activities which then must follow so that we can have a general and understandable overview, and especially so that we have an idea of the necessary financing. That having been stated, the success of peace-building depends on the will of the parties to the conflict to really put an end to hostilities as much as on the mobilization of the international community.

Experience has shown that three stumbling blocks must be avoided.

First of all, there is the competition between the protagonists and the temptation to go it alone. Close coordination is indispensable to ensure that all of the activities involved in fact are aimed at the stated objective. Redundancies, duplications, even contradictions represent a waste of very meagre resources. The special representative of the Secretary-General, therefore, has a pivotal role to play in ensuring coordination and avoiding overlapping and wastage; moreover, promising experience has been acquired in this area.

A second stumbling block, the lack of continuity between the different stages of international action after a conflict, can do major damage to the effectiveness of peace-building actions, in particular following the completion of an operation's mandate. An appropriate transition must be planned in order to avoid an interruption of programmes or the substitution in emergency situations of new partners who have a different approach from that which had been followed previously. I repeat, the Security Council must have this element in mind when it decides on the ending of an operation.

Finally — and this is the third stumbling block — the temptation to impose artificial and predetermined models in the various activity sectors for peace-building on the countries or parties involved must be fought off. If we wish these programmes to succeed and to achieve the established objectives, then they should be developed in a spirit of respect for diversity of the needs and characteristics of each country, such as cultural characteristics, and linguistic characteristics in particular. Otherwise, there are real risks of rejection and ultimately failure.

The maintenance of peace and the solution of conflicts hinge on an integrated approach to all aspects involved. It would be erroneous to isolate the military dimension from the other aspects, be they economic, social, cultural or institutional. The numerous crises which the Security Council has dealt with over the last few years are no longer exclusively classic inter-State conflicts but are very often — indeed most often — complex internal conflicts. Therefore, there is a need for approaches to include, as much as possible, all the dimensions. It is in this context that the activities of peace-building must be taken into account, planned for in advance by the Security Council.

This is the reason why we wish to thank you, Sir, for having convened this debate. I think that we will be more and more aware of this need to deal with the fundamental aspects of peace-building from the very outset of a crisis.

Mr. Monteiro (Portugal): It is with keen interest and great satisfaction that Portugal welcomes this thematic consideration by the Security Council of the importance of post-conflict peace-building activities in keeping and consolidating peace and security. We very much congratulate you, Sir, for organizing this debate.

The statement to be made later on by the Austrian Presidency of the European Union fully reflects our thinking on this matter, and I wish merely to add to and elaborate further on a number of points.

It is particularly gratifying for my delegation to participate in this debate today, since it was last year, during the first Portuguese presidency of the Security Council in April 1997, that we raised the issue of peace-building in a peacekeeping context. At that time, we recommended a discussion by the Council in order to identify those short-term activities — strictly speaking, post-conflict peace-building activities — which were essential to the functioning and, ultimately, the success of peacekeeping operations. Much work had been done by Germany in this respect in helping to define problematic areas, and we felt it was time for the Council itself to address the issue, especially where it had a direct impact on the elaboration of mandates and the very structure of the peacekeeping operations established by the Council. Unfortunately, it was not possible to hold the discussion at that time, but we wholeheartedly welcome its realization here today. This is an important debate which will help the United Nations trace the major lines of current thinking on the interplay between peace-building

activities and the immediate task of maintaining or restoring international peace and security.

In the increasingly multidisciplinary United Nations peacekeeping operations, particularly those involved in addressing intra-State conflicts, a number of peace-building activities have already been needed during the operational life of those peacekeeping operations as well as after their conclusion. The fact is that certain long-term tasks must be started early, even immediately following a ceasefire, and these are often foreseen in the elaboration of peace agreements.

These activities include the demobilization and disarmament of fighting forces; the transformation of armed movements into civil political parties; the reintegration of former combatants into society; the restructuring and unification of police and armed forces and ensuring that in their conduct, all forces meet international human rights standards; the return of refugees and displaced persons; demining programmes; support for political and legal institutions geared towards national reconciliation; and the holding of elections.

The successful conclusion of a peace process in situations of intra-State conflict is premised on national reconciliation, which in turn cannot be achieved without safeguarding the rights of individuals. Not only must their humanitarian and human rights be rigorously protected and upheld, but they must also be given a chance to secure their socio-economic well-being.

In today's peacekeeping, these are on many occasions fully mandated tasks and often make up the main work of the peacekeepers. And rightly so, since without them the recurrence of conflict is not only possible but likely. They act to remove immediate focuses of tension and other factors of destabilization that may threaten the peace process and its implementation.

These are the lessons which have been learned by the United Nations in a number of peacekeeping operations and are now being applied in the Central African Republic, in Liberia, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and elsewhere.

The strong link between peace-building activities and the immediate goals of establishing and maintaining peace and security was particularly evident in Mozambique, in the work of the United Nations Operation in Mozambique (ONUMOZ). The careful deployment and effective coordination of peacekeeping and peace-building components secured the successful consolidation of the peace process in Mozambique, which today continues rightly to be supported by the international community.

While peacekeeping operations still focus primarily on the military aspects of a peace agreement, the fact is that peace-building activities are increasingly important in ensuring the timely and full implementation of the terms of peace agreements and the fulfilment of peacekeeping mandates.

Peace-building is thus essential in the peacekeeping phase. Peace-building may be post-conflict but it is not, nor should it be, post-peacekeeping. It is important to make this point, since the proper use of peace-building activities in good time, before the end of peacekeeping mandates, will help bridge the transitional gap that inevitably appears between the withdrawal of the peacekeepers and the effective functioning of development activities which address the long-term causes of conflict. In this so-called twilight zone, conflict can erupt again very easily unless steps have been taken to disarm and demobilize, to find relevant occupations for ex-fighters and to help the wider process of national reconciliation through a participatory political process, including democratic elections.

Therefore, quite apart from their intrinsic value, peace-building activities in a peacekeeping context also seem to be sensible, sound insurance policies to secure the investments of the international community in bringing peace to conflict situations.

We welcome the increased attention given to this important dynamic by the Secretary-General, as evident in his report on the causes of conflict in Africa. While peace-building tasks are usually predetermined in the peace agreements which bring the fighting to an end and are subsequently integrated into the mandates of peacekeeping operations by the Security Council, it is up to the Secretary-General to ensure the effective coordination on the ground of all the activities of the various components of the operations so that they function in a complementary and coordinated fashion, thereby contributing to the consolidation of the peace process. For this to happen in optimal conditions, there should be a clear leadership and coordination structure on the ground, headed by his Special Representative, whose task is to deploy appropriately all those components at his or her disposal to ensure the stability of the peace process. Such flexibility should also include financial means.

Portugal also agrees with the Secretary-General that curtailing the availability of small arms in a post-conflict situation is a very important activity to reduce tensions and prevent the resumption of hostilities.

In this process of peacekeeping and peace-building, it is also essential to ensure the greatest degree possible of coordination among the efforts of the organs of the United Nations — the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council — and those of the United Nations programmes and agencies and the international financial and development institutions, as well as bilateral aid efforts. This will not only avoid duplication and overlap but also optimize the material and human investments in peace of the United Nations. An important role in this area is also played by non-governmental organizations.

In the wider realm of the maintenance of international peace and security, we have seen an important and appropriate division of labour with regional organizations, as foreseen in Chapter VIII of the Charter. We welcome this trend and, in this context, it is important also to identify the peace-building activities within peacekeeping that can benefit from an effective cooperation with regional organizations. A case in point, we believe, is Guinea-Bissau, which will require the careful attention of the United Nations, particularly the Security Council, and the continued excellent cooperation of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries (CPLP) in helping to establish the foundations for a long-lasting peace.

The present and future of United Nations peacekeeping is strongly based on the experiences of the past. Initially, experience indicated a need for larger and more comprehensive operations which sought to address each and every aspect of a conflict. Subsequently, a more realistic and efficient approach has been taken, tailored to each situation but still recognizing the need to expand the definition of peacekeeping tasks to include peace-building activities. This dynamic development of peacekeeping is the most effective use of the resources of the United Nations in the exercise of its responsibilities in the maintenance of international peace and security.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Portugal for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. Jagne (Gambia): In his widely acclaimed report entitled "The causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa", the Secretary-General defined post-conflict peace-building as

> "actions undertaken at the end of a conflict to consolidate peace and prevent a recurrence of armed confrontation". (*S/1998/318, para. 63*)

Since the absence of conflict does not necessarily mean the prevalence of peace, the consolidation process for the restoration of durable peace should start almost immediately — and we cannot agree more that time is of the essence. With the help of the rest of the international community — coupled with the required degree of political will — reintegration, rehabilitation and reconstruction programmes should be put in place as quickly as possible. This is one way of creating confidence-building measures that in turn could facilitate efforts geared towards national reconciliation.

This presupposes, of course, that, should there be a large number of refugees and displaced persons, the priority of priorities would be to ensure their safe repatriation and resettlement, with special attention given to women, children and the elderly.

It will be recalled that a few months ago, when we discussed a related topic — I am referring to the question of "Children and armed conflict" — Ambassador Olara Otunnu spoke at length on post-conflict peace-building and his plans to set up a pilot project in Sierra Leone for this purpose.

In neighbouring Liberia the first United Nations Peace-building Support Office has been established, and we can learn a lot from the experience acquired there to establish similar offices elsewhere. A United Nations presence, no matter how symbolic, always provides a feeling of security for the local populations, and, by extension, it has a salutary effect on confidence-building measures generally.

For all intents and purposes, the success of any peace-building programme depends to a large extent on the availability of resources. This is why a concerted and coordinated effort is indispensable for the effective mobilization of the necessary domestic and international resources.

In addition to the basic short-term peace-building programmes, there should be a sustained effort to support medium- and long-term programmes as well — such as the strengthening of national institutions, monitoring elections, the protection and promotion of human rights, good governance and so on and so forth.

This is all fine, but the crux of the matter is to address with equal zeal the question of sustainable development. Experience has shown that widespread poverty breeds conflict. It is difficult to envisage how democracy, good governance, the rule of law and respect for human rights can flourish in conditions of abject poverty. In order to achieve durable peace, the people must first be empowered. Then there will be no need to take up arms again.

Mr. Essonghé (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): The Council is meeting today to discuss the essential subject of the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building.

This debate, if it needs to be recalled, is inspired by one of the relevant questions addressed in the important report of the Secretary-General on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa. In holding this debate, the Security Council wished to promote reflection on the activities and role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security, most particularly in the area of peace-building.

Since the first peacekeeping operation, 50 years ago, the United Nations has considerably improved its methods and strategies in this area, despite the shortcomings that have been noted in some cases. This evolution is due to the emergence of new kinds of conflicts and the desire to achieve greater effectiveness in United Nations interventions.

Thus, after the cold-war period the United Nations devised and began undertaking multidimensional peacekeeping operations, the role of which is to monitor the implementation of the often complex peace agreements between Governments and dissident political movements. We would like to commend the realism and pragmatism shown by the United Nations, particularly in Africa, where the Organization has undertaken 13 of the 33 peacekeeping missions it has conducted throughout the world. The example of United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic (MINURCA) is an illustration of this new type of operation.

For its part, Africa, in accordance with Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations, has — particularly by means of regional and subregional arrangements — undertaken with remarkable success courageous peacekeeping missions in Liberia, Sierra Leone and, recently, in Guinea-Bissau.

Peacekeeping is not an end in itself. This is why we welcome the combination in these new types of operations of conventional peacekeeping tasks with political and humanitarian activities, as noted in a joint study of the International Peace Academy and the Organization of African Unity. This new approach to settling conflicts is a commendable innovation leading to post-conflict peace-building, which is the most critical stage in securing progress in the restoration and maintenance of peace. Indeed, without peace-building the efforts to achieve lasting settlements of conflicts remain superficial, fragile and precarious, because the causes and roots of the conflicts are not addressed.

In his 13 April 1998 report on the situation regarding conflicts in Africa, the Secretary-General defined post-conflict peace-building as:

> "actions undertaken at the end of a conflict to consolidate peace and prevent a recurrence of armed confrontation". (*S/1998/318, para. 63*)

These actions must be integrated and coordinated measures directed at eliminating the deep-seated causes of the violence, whatever their nature. Post-conflict peace-building must thus be considered a long-term strategy. Accordingly, we welcome the comprehensive measures that were adopted within the framework of the conflict settlement in the Central African Republic, where the United Nations Mission formulated a number of measures that took into consideration the most essential political, security and economic priorities. Specifically, MINURCA, together with other partners, proposed and recommended certain steps for rehabilitating the political landscape, security forces and the economy.

We should, however, also recall and consider here the role of the United Nations bodies, each in its own area of competence. While the Security Council is mandated by statute with the maintenance of international peace and security, tasks involving measures related to peace-building in areas such as human rights, refugees or development fall within the purview of other United Nations bodies. It would also be desirable if peacekeeping and peace-building operations could be

conducted within the strict framework of agreement and coordination, in harmony with the country concerned, and with scrupulous respect for that country's sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity.

During the first few meetings of the ad hoc Working Group established by resolution 1170 (1998), the Group was not able to reach a consensus on including post-conflict peace-building on its list of priority topics for discussion. Some delegations considered the question a complex one that did not fall within the purview of the Security Council. Others, on the basis of experience gained — particularly in the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia and MINURCA — maintained that the Council did have a role to play in post-conflict peace-building.

While emphasizing the limits of the authority of each organ of the United Nations, my delegation believes that good harmonization and proper coordination could give the Council the role of counsellor in post-conflict peace-building.

Mr. Amorim (Brazil): My delegation would like to thank you, Mr. President, as others have done, for organizing this debate on a very important subject.

Indeed, as I was reflecting on the very title of the agenda item for the debate, I thought that something was lacking, namely, the word "international". The title of this agenda item speaks about the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building. I thought that omission was not so serious because, in reality, it could just be implicit — as, for instance, some of the titles of the Articles and Chapters of the Charter speak of threats to peace, breaches of peace and so on. But, of course, the word "international" was clearly implicit when the Charter was written. In other Articles — such as Article 33, which has to do with the maintenance of peace, the subject with which we are dealing today — the word "international" appears very clearly. But, as I said, it might have just been a question of omitting a word that is implicit.

However, after having listened to some of the interventions, I think that the moment might indeed come when we could consider the interplay between internal and international conflicts, because that in itself is an important matter, and it is not without consequence. For instance, we have heard today — as we have heard several times outside this debate — that we are currently seeing increasing numbers of internal conflicts and that such is the nature of the conflicts we are having to face. Well, I do not think that statement is completely accurate. To begin with — and if you wish we could even go back to the French Revolution or even further — many of the conflicts of the past have been conflicts of an internal nature that have in some way or other became international. So there is nothing new about that — at least nothing extremely new.

On the other hand, many of the conflicts that we are still dealing with today are clearly international, such as the very important question of the Middle East. But even some other conflicts that we tend to treat as internal conflicts are really outgrowths of international conflicts. This is very clearly the situation in Angola, which is an issue that we have been trying to deal with here in the Council without much real success. This is really a conflict situation that is largely an outgrowth of the cold war. In fact, the existence and activities of at least one of the parties to that conflict are maintained largely due to the role it played at a certain stage of the cold war.

So I think that this clear distinction, as if we had moved from an era of international conflicts to an era of internal conflicts, is a subject to which we should devote a lot of attention and which should perhaps be the subject of a future debate. This is also important with relation to peace-building; and I will come to that in a moment. If we think of peace-building as also being a result of efforts to contain or solve internal conflicts, then I think the Security Council may be tempted to become a kind of resurrected Trusteeship Council. I believe that is a temptation that it should resist.

I therefore think, as several of my colleagues have already said, that when we deal with other aspects of these situations — such as economic and social aspects — we should pay attention to the appropriate competencies of other organs. And even if these countries do need some assistance in terms of good governance and internal political stability, I think we should be very careful as to how far we wish to take the action of the Security Council.

Pardon my digression, which was not in my prepared statement, but I think it was motivated by the tenor of the discussion, which is indeed a very interesting one and which can even motivate further discussions of the Council in the future.

Moments of discontinuity such as the world has experienced since 1989 can present Governments and institutions with particularly complex challenges. With the end of bipolarity, the potential for improved multilateral cooperation in the promotion of peace was

hailed across the globe. The Security Council met at the summit level in January 1992 to celebrate its reconquered unity and entrusted the Secretary-General with the task of defining a United Nations response to a new and promising emerging order. The "Agenda for Peace" and its supplement, cited here by Ambassador Dejammet, provided the Organization with a new lexicon. They had an unquestionable impact on the thinking within the Organization and beyond. The prospects for a new international consensus in dealing with conflict opened up encouraging possibilities for the establishment of a world system founded on justice and democracy, with the United Nations Charter at its centre. The Security Council seemed destined for a historic role in ensuring our transition to a safer world.

And yet, as we approach the end of the millennium, it appears that some in-depth thinking is required if we are to draw all the necessary lessons from a period of intense Security Council activity. At the end of a year that has witnessed the outbreak of new crises and a deterioration of several persisting conflicts, it does not seem possible for the Security Council to proceed much longer without scrutinizing its own performance. Whether or not we have reached a point where a new Security Council summit is called for is an open question, and one which we surely do not want to address today. However, we should not wait for the fractures in the Council's consensus to develop into cracks or gaps before reassessing our strengths and weaknesses.

According to a commentary published in a weekly magazine in the United States a few months ago, "the world hasn't looked this scary since the cold war". The renowned editor of *Foreign Affairs* has made a similar observation, to the effect that the post-cold-war era has ended, and with it the illusion that the entire world would be destined for conditions of rising wealth and stability in which war seemed absurd.

In a world of constant and often perplexing change it is fundamental to preserve the Security Council's authority to act in the maintenance of peace and security. Innovative ideas and policies have to be judged by this litmus test. We are not against change. We have been among the strongest advocates in the Organization for a reform of the Security Council. But at the same time, we view with uneasiness certain attempts currently being made that could undermine the foundations of collective security as defined by the Charter.

The United Nations has developed a valuable capacity to deal with international crises and threats to peace. At a time of transition such as ours, the need for global institutions is greater than ever. National Governments, no matter how powerful they may be individually or in the context of restricted groups, cannot legitimately aspire to promote a more peaceful world on their own while ignoring the views of the broader international community. True multilateralism on a global scale is and will remain the best model for international cooperation for the years to come.

A blueprint for enhancing the Security Council's authority should necessarily include a review of recent experience in the field of peacekeeping. Improvements in the Organization's rapid deployment capacity should continue to be sought through more open and transparent discussions. So-called "robust" operations have been tried successfully in specific circumstances, as in the case of Eastern Slavonia. It is important to recall, however, that, although established under Chapter VII, the United Nations Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sirmium (UNTAES) did enjoy the consent of the parties and, in that respect, did not deviate from the general peacekeeping doctrine which has evolved since the days of the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) and which remains the only acceptable basis for the deployment of United Nations peacekeepers.

As illustrated in the report *Words to Deeds: Strengthening the U.N.'s Enforcement Capabilities*, prepared by representatives from a variety of countries and backgrounds, there is a growing perception that the shortcomings of our present machinery for ensuring compliance with Security Council resolutions need to be seriously addressed. The *Words to Deeds* Task Force, which was ably chaired by Lord Carrington, was uncompromising, however, in its reaffirmation of the primacy of the Security Council as the sole body with legal authority to mandate enforcement actions. Likewise, it sustained that, in considering enforcement options, the use of military force should be considered only as a last resort. In addition, it stated that, when the use of force is seriously contemplated, it is preferable to do so through multilateral means. We fully subscribe to such views.

The fact that the United Nations has not, to this day, put into effect its original architecture for military enforcement might give rise to regret or relief, depending on the point of view. However, this should neither encourage Member States to look for unorthodox

solutions in defiance of the Charter, on the one hand, nor prevent us from considering the matter in the Security Council or in the General Assembly, for that matter.

The founders of the United Nations envisioned a partnership between the world body and regional arrangements and organizations. As everybody knows, this is even enshrined in Chapter VIII of the Charter. Regional global burden-sharing would in principle make as much sense for enforcement as it can make for peacekeeping. Moreover, regional initiatives can be particularly effective in the preventive or post-conflict phases of stabilization efforts.

Unfortunately, however, numerous actions of doubtful conformity with existing rules have taken place lately. Without going into the motives of such attitudes, which may have been legitimate in themselves and even have their goals shared by many countries, the fact remains that overt violations of sanctions regimes, or armed interventions and manifestations of readiness to use armed force by regional actors without the specific authority of the Security Council, raise serious legal as well as political questions. Enforcement interventions with no clear legal foundation will lack moral authority and will not be able to meet with the approval of world opinion in the long run.

For some time, we have been concerned with the absence of a satisfactory intergovernmental mechanism for dealing with countries coming out of conflict. Frequently, the most dire needs of such countries extend far beyond the security aspects and require efforts in the realm of economic and social development or institution-building. Haiti is a case in point, and perhaps soon the Central African Republic will be another, to cite just two examples.

The Secretary-General has recognized the importance of promoting new forms of cooperation between the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in his latest report on the work of the Organization. As Ambassador Lavrov recalled, Article 65 of the Charter has been quoted by the Secretary-General as providing a basis for achieving better communication and coordination between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. Security Council resolution 1212 (1998), adopted less than a month ago, set the stage, in an innovative way, for placing the situation in Haiti within a different context by inviting United Nations bodies and agencies, especially the Economic and Social Council — and I want to underline that — to contribute to the designing of a long-term programme of support for this least developed country of the Caribbean. It is now up to the Economic and Social Council to take up this challenging task.

Many of the situations that have found their way onto the Security Council's agenda involve very poor developing countries, whose struggle to heal the wounds left by conflicts often receive much less attention than the scenes of violence depicted live by the media. In relation to many such cases, it has been recognized that economic rehabilitation and reconstruction — as also recalled today by Ambassador Jagne of Gambia, among others — constitute the major tasks facing Governments and civil society. Without significant international assistance of a kind the Security Council is not in a position, either legally or materially, to supply, it would be unrealistic to entertain the idea that stabilization and reconciliation are attainable.

In the light of its recent experience, the Security Council should consider a return to a simple and direct approach to its responsibilities. In our view, Council members should focus their attention on three broad areas: first, diplomacy, or what might be said to fall under "pacific settlement of disputes" in Chapter VI; secondly, the establishment of parameters for peacekeeping operations; and, thirdly, the question of enforcement. In the specific context of enforcement, we would like to underline the importance of preserving the indispensable degree of harmony between regional initiatives and our universal collective security regime, in line with the Charter. As regards post-conflict situations, there is a clear need for the development of approaches that will permit a gradual disengagement of the Security Council and a progressive engagement of other intergovernmental deliberative instances with appropriate legal and substantive competence.

To conclude, we believe that the Security Council cannot go wrong by favouring diplomacy as the preferred instrument for promoting peace; by refining the doctrinal tenets and operational aspects of peacekeeping; and by striving to observe the provisions of the Charter and other instruments of international law in all matters falling under its purview, and most of all with respect to Chapter VII or enforcement action.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Brazil for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. Türk (Slovenia): The subject of today's open debate is well chosen and we wish to express our particular appreciation to you, Sir, for the choice. The Security Council is increasingly involved in issues of post-conflict peace-building and also of transition from peacekeeping to post-conflict peace-building. In some cases, these situations also involve intense cooperation with regional organizations and a variety of non-governmental groups.

The link between post-conflict peace-building and the maintenance of international peace and security is obvious. International peace and security are not fully ensured without the establishment of conditions for the durability of peace after a military conflict. Precarious situations which are fraught with the dangers of a recurrence of war are not peace. Peace is more than an absence of an active military conflict. It requires the necessary minimum of political stability and security, which can be achieved through post-conflict peace-building activities. The success of such activities is by no means automatically ensured.

The Ambassador of Brazil spoke before me about the interplay between international and internal conflicts. Let me go a step further in this matter by referring to a particular conflict, which is an internal conflict, but one with international ramifications.

In recent days, the situation in Angola has been rapidly deteriorating into yet another phase of widespread military conflict. This is very unfortunate for several reasons. The most basic reason is, clearly, that the people of Angola will be deprived of the benefits of peace for yet another uncertain and possibly long period of time. Equally disconcerting, however, is the fact that the current deterioration has occurred after a period of progress towards peace and after some post-conflict peace-building activities had been started.

I wish to recall that, at the beginning of this year, on 9 January 1998, the Government of Angola and UNITA agreed on a 10-point final timetable for the implementation of the Lusaka Protocol. That timetable contained such steps as the demobilization of UNITA, the disarmament of the civilian population, the consolidation of the Government's administration throughout the entire territory of the country and other measures of transition towards post-conflict peace-building.

The objectives of that timetable were not fulfilled, mainly due to the subsequent change of mind and obstruction by UNITA. As a result, general deterioration took place and the situation degenerated into a new armed conflict which adds to the prevailing crisis in that part of Africa. This example shows how a failure in the transition from the stage of peacekeeping to the stage of post-conflict peace-building can seriously undermine peace and security in a larger region.

Therefore, the importance of efforts to succeed cannot be overestimated, and the United Nations must do its utmost to help in the process of post-conflict peace-building. The experience of past years has shown that such efforts are no less difficult than those to contain and stop the war. As a matter of fact, they are difficult in a different way, given the inherent complexity of demands in the process of transition from military conflict to durable peace.

While addressing this notion of complexity, I wish to say that the complexity of the tasks in question was duly recognized by the Secretary-General in his seminal report entitled "An Agenda for Peace" in 1992 (S/24111) and in the "Supplement to an Agenda for Peace" in 1995 (S/1995/1). A more recent and more specific set of proposals by the Secretary-General is contained in his report entitled "The causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa" (S/1998/318), published earlier this year and extensively discussed by the Security Council in recent months.

In the 1992 report, "An Agenda for Peace", the Secretary-General emphasized the importance of cooperative projects involving two or more countries in mutually beneficial undertakings intended to stabilize peace and ensure development. More generally, the Secretary-General emphasized:

> "When conflict breaks out, mutually reinforcing efforts at peacemaking and peacekeeping come into play. Once these have achieved their objectives, only sustained, cooperative work to deal with underlying economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems can place an achieved peace on a durable foundation." (*S/24111, para. 57*)

Slovenia has expressed its agreement with this general approach of the Secretary-General and has promised support. The question before the Governments of the United Nations Member States has been and will continue to be: what specifically can they contribute to the inherently cooperative nature of efforts for post-conflict peace-building? Which projects require practical contributions by Governments in the region concerned and beyond, and which require sustained political

support? When such questions are asked, the issue of post-conflict peace-building becomes very specific, and therefore permit me to make a few specific observations on two areas of post-conflict peace-building.

One of the first priorities of any process towards post-conflict peace-building is mine action, which consists of demining, assistance to mine victims and the creation of mine awareness in the public at large.

The implementation of provisions of international instruments regarding demining and destruction of landmines must be the first priority. This is necessary not only to thwart the recurrence of a conflict, but also to minimize the land whose use is restricted by infestation and to expedite the return of refugees and internally displaced persons to both their zones and their livelihoods. Rehabilitation of mine victims is an important condition of normalization after a conflict and, perhaps most importantly, the way to restore both the productivity and the human dignity of those most severely affected. Mine awareness needs to be created and supported as part of the effort to mobilize the population for post-conflict activities. Peace cannot be sustained and development cannot thrive in an atmosphere where an explosion could wound any one at any time. Successful mine action, namely an action successful in all three main areas, strengthens both peace and development.

For all these reasons mine action must be considered as early as possible in the peace settlement process. Short-term priorities should therefore be carefully designed so as to reinforce the process of long-term mine action. It is important that mine action be integrated into the negotiation of peace agreements and that mine action take place as soon as possible. Ideally, humanitarian concerns on mine action should be part of the peacekeeping function itself. Close coordination between peacekeeping and humanitarian activities is needed so that mine action can start as an immediate priority of post-conflict peace-building.

At later stages, it may become necessary that the number of those involved in the mine action increases and that the cooperation projects of post-conflict peace-building called for in "An Agenda for Peace" are taken seriously. Slovenia is aware of these needs in all post-conflict situations, including, for example, those in Croatia and in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and is actively involved in mine action, especially through its international trust fund for demining and mine victims assistance in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Demining, rehabilitation of mine victims and mine awareness become parts of a longer-term effort for stabilization of the situation after the conflict and for promotion of durable peace.

Another set of priorities relates to the need to stabilize peace through justice and protection of human rights. Often the credibility of justice demands that past violations be properly addressed. This may require that retributive justice be accepted as an essential ingredient of peace-building. Justice is a value in itself. Additionally, it is a basic condition for durability of peace.

The international community has gained important experience in pursuit of these tasks in the preceding years. The situations concerned range from those in Central America to South-East Asia and from Europe to the Great Lakes region in Africa. Earlier this year some of the main experiences in this regard were systematically analysed and presented in a book published by the Aspen Institute, entitled *Honoring Human Rights: From Peace to Justice*. That book showed that while the facts of each situation varied, in each there has been a need to give a proper meaning to peace through the efforts to strengthen human rights and to address the violations and war crimes of the recent past. The International Criminal Tribunals for Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia are of vital importance for building real and durable peace. Various truth commissions established in recent years in some countries have also had beneficial effects.

A particularly important task relates to institution-building, which characterized several operations recently authorized by the Security Council. While most post-conflict missions start with monitoring the situation of human rights, monitoring is often not enough and has to be complemented by international support for institution-building. The projects of reforming or establishing national and local police forces should include human rights training and education, emphasize the relations between the police and the local community and focus on long-term sustainability of the police function. Judicial systems often require reforms intended to ensure their adequacy and their compatibility with generally accepted international standards. A particularly important task is to address the issue of impunity and to ensure that amnesty laws are in accordance with international law.

The experience of the United Nations and other international organizations over the past few years has confirmed the validity of the views expressed in "An Agenda for Peace" in 1992. Most importantly, perhaps, it has demonstrated that the complexity of the tasks

requires a genuinely cooperative attitude of a variety of international agencies and organizations — global and regional, governmental and non-governmental — and the active involvement of United Nations Member States.

The experience of past years has also confirmed the need for all the relevant United Nations organs and agencies to take part in a cooperative manner. Several speakers before me referred to the role of the Economic and Social Council, and I agree with those opinions. I wish to add a point on the General Assembly, which, in my opinion, also has a role. The value of the Assembly's role in providing the broadest political framework for international efforts to consolidate peace and post-conflict peace-building has been reaffirmed in recent practice. The annual consideration by the General Assembly of the situations in Central America and in Bosnia and Herzegovina are cases in point.

The open debate in the Security Council today is part of a broader cooperative scheme of international efforts in situations of post-conflict peace-building. We hope that the views expressed in this debate will help in advancing the effectiveness of post-conflict peace-building and thus the maintenance of international peace and security.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Slovenia for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mrs. Odera (Kenya): My delegation, too, welcomes the decision to hold a debate on this important topic, in particular given its relevance to our continent, and we wish to thank you, Mr. President.

Primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security rests with the Security Council. International consensus on a proper Security Council response to situations of conflict is evolving. For a long time in the past the most obviously acceptable definition and the most practical measure in the hands of the Security Council in responding to a conflict situation was the deployment of peacekeepers within the limits of Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter. That was in addition to preventive measures such as diplomatic efforts, negotiation, mediation, good offices and fact-finding missions.

At the end of the cold war it became immediately practical for the Security Council to agree on a more proactive definition that included other efforts not entirely falling within the confines of Chapter VI. Thus peace enforcement, which is now more and more in use under Chapter VII, has gained regard as a necessary and regular aspect of international consensus.

Today there is a growing realization that societies emerging from situations of conflict are themselves in conflict situations, and that specific measures are needed at the national and international levels to deal with those situations. Certain specific measures and programmes are required to be put in place to address the critical priorities involved. The objective is to encourage the delicate process of nurturing peace and, more important, to prevent a recurrence of the forces of conflict. There are many kinds of actions that need to be taken at the end of a conflict in order to consolidate peace and prevent the recurrence of armed confrontation. Such actions include efforts aimed at national reconciliation; the establishment of national unity; the safe, smooth and early repatriation and resettlement of refugees and displaced persons; the reintegration of ex-combatants and others into productive society; the establishment of well-managed regulatory institutions; and the establishment of a fair and reliable legal and judicial system and of a civilian police force.

Those programmes and measures are today popularly categorized under the subject of post-conflict peace-building activities. They may also include economic programmes. In his report entitled "The causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa", submitted to the Security Council in April 1998, the Secretary-General rightly pointed out:

> "Where a country's capacity to develop and implement a comprehensive economic programme has been disrupted by conflict, consideration must be given to relaxing the normally strict financial conditions imposed by international lending institutions." (*S/1998/318, para. 67*)

He goes on to say that some conditionalities may be antithetical to the peace process, and suggests that peace-friendly programmes be tailored to fit the particular situation.

The multidisciplinary nature of the post-conflict peace-building situation requires effective and politically sensitive coordination in order to put in place the requisite strategic framework to deal with this special situation. Lessons learned from recent United Nations experiences in post-conflict peace-building situations point to the need for the Secretary-General to set up a peace-

building support structure to coordinate these activities. In such a situation, the ideal person to head such an office would be a political representative of the Secretary-General, preferably assisted by the United Nations Development Programme Resident Coordinator.

Such an arrangement must have the full support of the Security Council. It has been argued elsewhere that such support from the Council would be outside its mandate. It is the conviction of my delegation that, on the contrary, post-conflict peace-building activities are within the proper scope and mandate of the Council, precisely like diplomatic efforts, negotiations, mediation, good offices and fact-finding missions, because they have the same objective of preventing conflict. The Security Council should therefore rise to the occasion and support such efforts to the extent possible, in order to ensure the successful conclusion of its tasks in a given conflict situation.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Kenya for the kind words she addressed to me.

Mr. Konishi (Japan): I would like to begin by expressing my appreciation to you, Mr. President, for convening this meeting on the subject of post-conflict peace-building, the importance of which was stressed by the Secretary-General in his report (S/1998/318) on Africa.

There is a common recognition throughout the international community today that durable peace and sustainable development are two sides of the same coin. One cannot be achieved without the other. The achievement of those two goals will require a coherent and comprehensive approach.

Such an approach is particularly necessary in the context of post-conflict peace-building. Indeed, it is precisely in a situation where a conflict has been settled and the roles of political, humanitarian and development actors are intertwined, that the coordination of their respective efforts becomes crucial. Japan thus subscribes fully to the point made by the Secretary-General concerning the need for a strategic framework for their activities during this phase.

Let me address the three major categories of actors that need to be engaged during the phase of post-conflict peace-building one by one.

In the first category are those who play a political and security role in the country concerned. The Security Council certainly falls into this category, whether or not its activities are in the form of peacekeeping operations. Other notable actors in this category are regional organizations, like the Organization for African Unity (OAU).

The second category of actors playing an important role in post-conflict peace-building comprises of humanitarian agencies, such as the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). In the third category are development agencies, such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank.

The humanitarian and development agencies, in collaboration with the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, have already done much to improve coordination among the actors in all three categories. For example, there is in place the practice of deploying representatives of development agencies at an early stage of peacekeeping activities. In addition, UNDP, in collaboration with OCHA, is working out a set of guidelines for efforts to be made by the Special Representatives and Special Envoys of the Secretary-General and by the Resident Coordinators. We believe that such coordination efforts must also be made by the Security Council within its own competence.

In the post-conflict phase there is a range of political and security tasks which require the support of the international community. First, there is the challenge of national reconciliation. In this respect, the international community, and particularly the Security Council, must monitor the implementation of the peace accord and call upon the parties concerned to make necessary efforts in that regard. Efforts to foster an environment in which free and fair elections can be held are also necessary. There may also be a need to establish an international criminal tribunal. These issues must be successfully addressed in order to lay the foundation for effective humanitarian and development assistance activities.

The Security Council may also be required to provide support for humanitarian agencies in times of political and social instability during the post-conflict peace-building phase. Such support might range from protecting humanitarian assistance operations to assistance for the repatriation of refugees and the resettlement of displaced persons.

The Security Council might also assist in the collection of weapons and in mine-clearing actions, thereby facilitating the return to normal daily life throughout the society.

I would like to suggest that, in order to strengthen the basis for coordination among various bodies and agencies on the ground, the Security Council take into consideration each of these roles as it formulates its response to any conflict, and particularly as it decides on the mandate of a peacekeeping operation.

As I mentioned earlier, the importance of efforts by the international community in post-conflict peace-building was stressed in the report of the Secretary-General on Africa. Among the several ongoing conflicts in Africa, I would like to touch on the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, since it is the conflict in that country which now poses the greatest threat to the security of the region as a whole.

At this stage, I believe the international community should make an effort to bring home to the parties participating in the negotiations for a ceasefire in the Democratic Republic of the Congo that a cessation of hostilities is just the beginning of a long peace process and that they should pay due consideration to the basic elements of post-conflict peace-building in negotiating the ceasefire agreement. It would be most desirable for the ceasefire agreement to include a political plan, such as a timetable, for achieving a peace accord, an affirmation of their commitment to ensuring free and unhindered access by international humanitarian agencies to the people in need and a demand that all parties refrain from laying additional landmines, and that the locations of the landmines that have already been laid be identified. If these elements are clearly stated in the ceasefire agreement and subsequently observed by all the parties concerned, the security environment and social stability will be strengthened, thus paving the way for more smooth post-conflict peace-building activities.

I wish to remind the Council that on 7 December the General Assembly, in its resolution on the report of the Secretary-General on Africa, stressed the importance of improved coordination among the various bodies and agencies of the United Nations system in assisting post-conflict peace-building, reconciliation, reconstruction and development in Africa. The Economic and Social Council decided that in the coming year it would follow up on the recommendations put forward in that report. There is a clear need for these three major bodies of the United Nations, including this Council, to pay due attention to each other's actions and coordinate among themselves. It is Japan's hope that the Security Council, for its part, will take the necessary steps — such as establishing a channel or a mechanism to ensure proper communication and exchange of views with other bodies and agencies in the United Nations system — so that it will be better prepared to respond to future post-conflict situations that may require action.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Japan for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. Dahlgren (Sweden): My delegation, too, very much welcomes your initiative, Mr. President, for an open debate in the Security Council on the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building. The title of the agenda item for this debate reflects some of the most important challenges facing the Council and the United Nations as a whole today.

We know that the absence of war is not the same as a lasting peace. We know that a ceasefire is seldom the end of conflict, but should hopefully be the beginning of peace. We know from all too many situations how difficult it is to sustain a peace which is kept but not truly built. And we know that finding durable solutions to complex conflicts requires cooperation across institutional boundaries between organizations and States.

A long-term and comprehensive perspective is necessary to resolve conflicts and to consolidate peace. This perspective is evident in the Secretary-General's report entitled "The causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa." It is clear that building lasting peace will require solutions that encompass development, democracy, human rights, conflict prevention and resolution, peacekeeping and humanitarian assistance. All these elements are necessary in order to prevent war and to ensure human security, and they are all directly relevant to the responsibility of the Security Council under the Charter.

The Secretary-General plays a crucial role in the peace-building efforts of the United Nations. We welcome the fact that he has attached such importance to the establishment of post-conflict peace-building structures as one way of helping countries recover from conflict. The United Nations Office in Liberia, for example, which I visited last week, is the latest example of such a peace-building presence, and we hope that the

Secretary-General will consider establishing a United Nations post-conflict presence in other situations as well.

Clearly, the Security Council has a responsibility to ensure that its efforts to prevent conflict and promote peace are followed by measures aimed at preventing the resurgence of conflict and the strengthening of peace, stability and reconciliation. When possible, these long-term aims should be taken into account at an early stage of the Council's deliberations on a particular crisis or conflict. The Council also has a responsibility to ensure that the transition to the post-conflict phase is as smooth as possible, whether or not that entails decisions to change a United Nations presence on the ground or to end an operation mandated by the Council.

The United Nations role in the peace process in Guatemala is a particularly clear example of post-conflict peace-building in action, an effort which involved the Security Council and the General Assembly, as well as United Nations agencies. It is also an example of the value of integrating a peace-building perspective in peace agreements themselves.

The mandates of United Nations peacekeeping operations must also include the elements needed to help secure a lasting peace. Multifunctional operations are playing an increasingly important role, as evidenced by the successful efforts of the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic, and we fully agree with the Secretary-General that peace-building elements should be explicitly and clearly integrated into the mandates of peacekeeping operations. We encourage the Secretary-General to pursue this approach when making recommendations to the Council on new peacekeeping operations. We hope that when planning for a possible peacekeeping operation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, such an integrated approach will also be considered. That is a conflict where there can be little doubt that a lasting solution will require comprehensive long-term efforts by the international community.

Even when post-conflict peace-building elements are not included in the original mandate of a peacekeeping operation, recommendations concerning the transitional period and the post-conflict phase should be included in the decision on the final drawdown of the operation, and multifunctional elements with the aim of ensuring sustainable peace and security can, of course, also be added during the conduct of an operation, for instance at the time of mandate extensions.

Post-conflict peace-building efforts may include demobilization, disarmament and reintegration into society of former combatants. Special attention is all too often called for to address the plight of child soldiers. Other important peace-building elements are the transformation of armed movements into civilian parties and support for the restructuring of police and armed forces. Experience also shows the importance of strengthening the judicial system, demining, reconciliation and confidence-building measures, as well as international support for elections.

We attach particular importance to efforts to deal with refugees and other displaced persons in the post-conflict phase. The concentration of such groups in temporary settlements has obvious implications for the stability of the host country or area, and the repatriation and return of refugees and displaced persons is not always a smooth process.

I began by speaking of challenges. One of the most difficult is perhaps that of ensuring coherence, coordination and dialogue between the bodies of the United Nations system and other actors involved in post-conflict efforts. We strongly welcome the continued development of the strategic framework within the United Nations. We firmly support the idea of the strategic framework as a tool enabling the United Nations to respond to crisis situations in a comprehensive, coherent and effective manner.

From the perspective of the Security Council, it is obviously important that there not be a vacuum in a transition between operations mandated by the Council and other peace-building efforts. For example, we could foresee cases where Council members and troop contributors would benefit from meeting with the Secretariat, United Nations agencies and the Bretton Woods institutions specifically to discuss a transition from one kind of United Nations presence to another.

We think that we have a responsibility not to close an operation unless we have a clear view of the road ahead, and unless we know that what has been invested to bring about peace will be followed up and will be maintained.

Today's open debate is proof in itself of the importance of post-conflict peace-building in the work of the Security Council. I hope that it will prove possible to follow up today's discussion, both in decisions relating to specific conflicts before the Council and as a thematic

issue of key importance. My delegation, of course, would be prepared to work with other members of the Council on such a formal follow-up.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of Sweden for the kind words he addressed to me.

Sir Jeremy Greenstock (United Kingdom): It is a great pleasure, Sir, to see you in the Chair this month. Thank you for convening this important meeting.

This discussion of the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building is a valuable opportunity to improve the way we respond to our duty to promote human security, which the Secretary-General, in his report on Africa, called "the cardinal mission of the United Nations". (*S/1998/318, para. 2*)

A task of this magnitude goes well beyond the specific Charter responsibilities of the Security Council. The Council's role in conflict resolution can only be effective if it is part of a wider effort by the United Nations system. We lack, and must try to develop, more coordinated means of identifying and responding to crises so that the work of the Council is complemented by and integrated with the work of agencies including the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

The Security Council now regularly receives briefings from the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs at our informal consultations. This is a major step forward. The briefings of Mr. Vieira de Mello and his staff have proved the value of the coordinating role given to him by the Secretary-General. Mrs. Ogata's briefing during the presidency of the United States in November was a step which must be built on, for example by scheduling similar encounters with the heads of other agencies, funds and programmes. We should also devise means of cooperating with other interested organizations. For example, the lack of a consistent mechanism for consultation between the Council and the Organization of African Unity on matters affecting peace and security in Africa is an issue which needs to be addressed sooner rather than later.

If our efforts at peace-building are to be placed on firm foundations, we must take into account the role of the international financial institutions and such regional organizations as the European Union in post-conflict peace-building. The Presidency of the European Union will be making a statement later today with which the United Kingdom fully agrees. It is in Washington and Brussels that the major part of the world's financing for peace-building is found. The Security Council needs to devise ways to ensure that its political objectives complement the financial recovery packages which these bodies put in place.

The United Kingdom believes that coordination must start in the field if it is to be effective. The development of a strategic framework for United Nations action has the potential to produce improved results in the building of peace. We are following with interest its application in Afghanistan. Now is the time to consider testing the model in other situations. We should also seek to improve, where possible, the application of the concept. Afghanistan shows the need for all United Nations efforts in the field — political, humanitarian and developmental — to be placed under the authority of a single high-profile figure. That person should have the political weight to ensure that coordination is transformed from a theory into an effective, normal practice.

Peace-building does not start where peacekeeping stops. Peacekeeping will work best if it incorporates post-conflict peace-building. We must not, in constructing mandates for our operations, lose sight of the need to ensure that when a peacekeeping force withdraws the war does not resume. This means that operations need to ensure the development of local law and order capabilities, the restructuring of armed forces on a constitutional basis and the restoration of economic activity through properly planned infrastructure programmes. Civilian police components, demining programmes and the demobilization and reintegration of former combatants will often be essential elements of future multidimensional peacekeeping operations. Beyond this, peace-building means the strengthening of civil society, building local democratic institutions and ensuring that the rights of women, men and children are protected, in particular by ending the culture of impunity which all too often surrounds gross violations of human rights. We also need to ensure that conditions exist to resume the development process. Many of these activities will continue after the peacekeeping troops have left, and we need to think through mechanisms for assuring and financing the transition. Peace-building is a long-term process lasting many years after a peacekeeping operation withdraws. That means we must be ready to support it in the long term if peace is to be sustainable.

In fact, the wider aspects of peacekeeping operations are already being taken up by missions which no longer have a traditional peacekeeping element. The United Nations Verification Mission in Guatemala, the United Nations Civilian Police Mission in Haiti and the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia are three very different examples of this welcome evolution in the type of operations which can be undertaken by the United Nations. But we must look carefully at the budgetary arrangements. These operations must be financed in a stable and predictable manner. An appropriate provision should be made for them in the regular budget for each biennium.

The report this year by the Secretary-General on Africa (S/1998/318) gave us a useful stock of ideas on conflict prevention and peace-building. We have addressed in the Council those aspects of the report which fall within our exclusive purview. While the United Kingdom recognizes that a number of the Secretary-General's recommendations, especially those on post-conflict peace-building, range widely over the responsibilities of the Security Council and other organs of the United Nations system, we believe that the Council must not ignore their implications for its work. This opportunity to discuss post-conflict peace-building as an overarching issue is therefore welcome. But it is not enough. Peace-building will be of no value if it is treated solely as an academic subject. We must apply the lessons of this discussion and the wider wisdom of the Secretary-General's report in addressing current and potential conflict situations around the world. And we should continue to look for mechanisms, such as today's debate, which will allow us to pause, assess how we are doing and see whether we can do things better. All this will require an effort of imagination and an effort of will for all of us on the Council.

I would like to take this opportunity to assure you, Mr. President, my other colleagues on the Council and the Secretary-General of my delegation's full support in undertaking this shared task.

The President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for the kind words he addressed to me.

I shall now make a statement as the representative of Bahrain.

As I am the last speaker before the Security Council this morning, let me express my gratification at hearing such valuable thoughts on the matter before the Council today: the maintenance of peace and security and post-conflict peace-building, an item that demonstrates the need for several more meetings of this kind. Such meetings give Council members an opportunity to express their views on general topics of interest to the United Nations, outside the context of debating specific items on the Council's agenda. They also give non-members of the Council an opportunity to address the general topics of mutual concern.

Post-conflict peace-building and peacekeeping are among the important topics that the international community must address. The taking of effective post-conflict measures would further peace and prevent the recurrence of armed confrontation. Experience has shown that post-conflict peace consolidation calls for intensified efforts to address the root causes of conflicts.

Peace-building and peacekeeping call for building and consolidating national institutions, reforming and bolstering governmental organizations and strengthening those in charge of public order to protect the nation. It also calls for reintegration and rehabilitation programmes and for creating opportunities to resume the development process. Maintaining internal security, rebuilding confidence and invigorating socio-economic machinery in the country are critical for post-conflict peace-building.

For this to take place, the time factor is extremely important in peace-building. A multidisciplinary approach must be pursued to include all social and economic aspects simultaneously. To avoid the risk of a renewal of hostilities, there should not be a long interval after the end of the peacekeeping efforts. Moving speedily to post-conflict peace-building is critical.

The establishment of structures to support peace-building should be considered, and a study should be undertaken to evaluate the basic requirements of peace-building and how it should be carried out once the elements of peace-building have been clearly determined.

The priorities of post-conflict peace-building require solid foundations for development. To arrive at this objective, we must underline the need for reconciliation, the promotion of national unity, the repatriation of refugees and displaced persons and their safe resettlement in their homelands, the reintegration of former combatants into society and the mobilization of national and international resources in support of reconstruction and economic recovery. This calls for tremendous efforts on behalf of everyone.

Post-conflict peace-building is a multidimensional process. It calls for tremendous efforts and effective coordination on the part of the international community. The role of the United Nations in support of peace and in coordinating efforts is extremely important. The efforts of the United Nations in Liberia are a case in point.

The establishment of United Nations peacekeeping, peace-building or humanitarian missions requires the United Nations to guarantee the safety of United Nations personnel. The number of those who have died while in service has been on the rise; this is totally unacceptable.

The presence of the United Nations after the end of a conflict has a stabilizing and reassuring effect. It helps prevent a renewal of hostilities.

Development is considered a primary objective for all countries. Development is essential for reducing the number of conflicts. Sustainable development can enhance and accelerate the post-conflict peace-building process.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to stress the importance of the United Nations organs' implementation of their mandates as provided for by the Charter.

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

There are a number of speakers remaining on my list. With the concurrence of the members of the Council, I intend to suspend the meeting now and to resume it at 3 p.m.

The meeting was suspended at 11.40 a.m.